

## **REMARKS**

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the “control engine” of Claims 7-25 and the “plurality of register banks” in Claims 23 are not shown. Fig. 1 has been amended to show a control engine 105 in communication with the thirty-two registers 100, the support for which is found in amended Paragraph 10 on pages 2-3 of the specification. An annotated copy of Fig. 1 is enclosed herewith showing such amendments in red. Claims 23 and 24 have been cancelled. With this explanation and these amendments, it is assumed that the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) will be withdrawn.

The specification has been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claims subject matter. The Examiner states that the specification does not specifically disclose “a first operational code is associated with a first block and a second operation is associated with a second block,” as called for in Claims 5 and 20. Paragraph 15, lines 10-11 discloses that the control register 118 further contains an operational code 142 providing direction for handling operations on the designated block. Block operations are defined by the operational code associated with it, and thus, there is one operation code for handling operations on the designated block and different operational codes for handling operations on different blocks. Accordingly, the specification specifically discloses “a first operational code is associated with a first block and a second operation is associated with a second block,” as disclosed in Claims 5 and 20. With this explanation, it is assumed that the objection to the specification will be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 19, and 22 have been objected to because of the following informalities: (a) the phrase “plurality of registers” in Claim 14 is confusing; (b) the phrase “plurality of third registers” in Claim 19 is confusing; and (c) the word “location” is misspelled in Claim 22. Claim 14 has been amended to read “plurality of location registers.” Claim 19 has been amended to read “plurality of control registers.” Claim 22 has been amended such that “location” is spelled correctly. It is now assumed that the objections to Claims 14, 19, and 22 will be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed above with respect to the Objection to the Specification, block operations are defined by the operational code associated with it. Therefore, there is one operation code for handling operations on the designated block

and different operational codes for handling operations on different blocks. With this explanation, it is assumed that the rejection of Claims 5 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, will be withdrawn.

Claim 20 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this regard, Claim 20 has been amended to read “said plurality of location registers.” With this amendment, it is assumed that the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, will be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 15-18, 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Don Pannell, “Clause 22 Access to Clause 45 Registers” (Pannell). Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pannell in view of Nick Parlante “Pointers and Memory” (Parlante). Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pannell in view of Webb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,694,587). Reconsideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

Pannell discloses a backwards compatible way to access IEEE standard 802.3 clause 45 registers using 802.3 clause 22 registers. Pg. 5. Clause 22 Register 13 is used as a Clause 45 Address/Data Register. Pg. 6. Only the single register selected by Register 13 will respond to Register 13. Pg. 24.

Claim 1 is patentable by calling for a method for expanding addressing capability of a plurality of registers connected to an interface comprising designating at least two of the plurality of registers as a block of registers and designating a first register within the plurality of registers that is separate from the blocks of registers for selectively characterizing at least one of such blocks of registers as an indicated block of registers. In contrast, and as discussed above, Pannell allows only a single register in a larger group of registers to be accessed at any given time. Pannell does not disclose a method of the type called for in Claim 1 that selectively characterizes at least one of such blocks of registers as an indicated block of registers. In view of the foregoing, the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Pannell should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1 and by reason of the additional limitations called for therein.

Claim 7 is patentable by calling for a system for expanding the addressing capability of a plurality of registers, the system comprising a plurality of blocks of registers, each block of registers having at least two registers and a location register separate from the plurality of blocks of registers for selectively characterizing at least one of the blocks of registers as a specified block of registers. As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Pannell does not disclose selectively characterizing at least one of the blocks of registers as a specified block of registers.

Claims 8-22 and 25 depend from Claim 7 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 7 and by reason of the additional limitations called for therein.

New Claim 26 is patentable by calling for a method for expanding addressing capability of a plurality of registers, comprising designating at least two of the plurality of registers as a block of registers and designating a first register within the plurality of registers that is separate from the blocks of registers for selectively characterizing at least one of such blocks of registers as an indicated block of registers. As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Pannell does not disclose selectively characterizing at least one of the blocks of registers as a specified block of registers. Therefore, new Claim 26 is patentable in view of Pannell.

New Claims 27-29 depend from new Claim 26 and are patentable for the same reasons as new Claim 26 and by reason of the additional limitations called for therein.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of record are allowable and that the application should be passed to issue. Should the Examiner believe that the application is not in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would help further prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Edward N. Bachand  
Reg. No. 37,085

Customer No. 32,940  
555 California Street, Suite 1000  
San Francisco, CA 94104-1513  
Telephone No.: (650) 857-1717  
Facsimile No.: (650) 857-1288  
4813-3821-6961\1